

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

JEFFREY PRATT, : **CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:04-CV-1083**

Plaintiff : **(Judge Conner)**

v.

ROBERT SHANNON, et al., :

Defendants :

JEFFREY PRATT, : **CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:04-CV-1108**

Plaintiff : **(Judge Conner)**

v.

SERGEANT CISKO, et al., :

Defendants :

JEFFREY PRATT, : **CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:04-CV-1313**

Plaintiff : **(Judge Conner)**

v.

BARBARA MALEWSKI, et al., :

Defendants :

ORDER

AND NOW, this 8th day of August, 2005, upon consideration of plaintiff's motion for an enlargement of time in which to file a response showing cause why

the above-captioned cases¹ should not be dismissed with prejudice, in light of plaintiff's "notice to withdraw" and defendants' objection to dismissal without prejudice, see FED. R. CIV. P. 41(a)(2) ("[A]n action shall not be dismissed at the plaintiff's instance save upon order of the court and upon such terms and conditions as the court deems proper."), it is hereby ORDERED that the motion² is GRANTED as follows:

1. Plaintiff shall file, on or before September 16, 2005, a response showing cause why the above-captioned cases should not be dismissed with prejudice.
2. Failure to file a timely response will be deemed a request that the above-captioned cases be dismissed with prejudice. See FED. R. CIV. P. 41(a)(2).

S/ Christopher C. Conner
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER
United States District Judge

¹ These cases have been consolidated solely for purposes of this decision. See FED. R. CIV. P. 42.

² The motion includes several unsupported and scurrilous accusations against defense counsel and the court, see Response by Plaintiff, Pratt v. Shannon, No. 1:04-CV-1083 (M.D. Pa. filed July 25, 2005), and would properly be stricken from the record. The court will overlook these improprieties in this instance but will advise plaintiff to maintain a respectful tone in future filings. Sanctions are the alternative. See FED. R. CIV. P. 11(c).